

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/565,674	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BIERHOFF, THOMAS	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kajli Prince	<b>Art Unit</b> 2874	

**All Participants:**

 (1) Kajli Prince.

 (2) Kevin Speivak.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 11 October 2007
**Time:** 11:40 am
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

7

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: I informed Mr. Speivak that claim 7 was in improper form. The preamble suggests Applicant is claiming a device, however, the body of the claim recites functional steps. Therefore, suggesting Applicant is claiming a method. Mr. Speivak reviewed the claim and left a message on 15 October 2007 around 12:10pm giving permission to cancel the claim..